



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Sainte-Beuve singled out the individual. That was the great point of his method. Arnold tried to imitate him in this, but was only partially successful, and then, chiefly, in foreign subjects. Like the preacher in the pulpit, he preferred to deal with masses.

It is a pity that Matthew Arnold was not so situated in life as to come into greater intimacy with the "first of living critics," as he calls Sainte-Beuve. A more frequent contact with him would have changed Arnold's critical method completely. With a style of such ease, fluency, grace, and firmness as Arnold's, it would have required only a little more real flexibility of mind and a more comprehensive groundwork of facts to have left us a body of criticism classical not merely in form, but in substance as well. Arnold wrote to his wife, "I think he (Sainte-Beuve) likes me, and likes my caring so much about his criticisms and appreciating his extraordinary tact and judgment in literature." How that persuasive, insinuating personality of Sainte-Beuve's would have softened the positive style of statement which Arnold inherited from his father, the worthy Arnold of Rugby! How it would have taught Arnold to encourage the literature of his own day; to be sympathetic and helpful to those struggling upward; to regard himself in criticism not as an oracle, but as a workman, with hands to be soiled in the rearing of admirable structures!

Matthew Arnold just missed becoming what Sainte-Beuve has now for a long time been,—an indispensable and lovable guide in literature. Perhaps the English Channel is to blame. Whatever of Sainte-Beuve's teachings was absorbed by Arnold has enriched English criticism. Both men, as poets, as men of open and inquiring minds, as masters of language, had the same path before them, and the same glory at the end of it. The one became the most pervasive force which has appeared in any literature: the other became a model of style. Less of Jeremiah and more of Sainte-Beuve would have made Arnold a great critic. As it is, we owe to Sainte-Beuve's influence the most charming critical essays in English literature.

J. WARSHAW.

University of Missouri.

SIR THOMAS NORRAY AND SIR THOPAS.

Of Dunbar's general indebtedness to Chaucer there has never been any doubt. The Scottish "makar" acknowledges his English master, and critics have not hesitated to enroll him in the "school" of Chaucerians. The idea seems to prevail, however, that, as Professor Gregory Smith puts it, Dunbar follows Chaucer "at a distance and, perhaps, with divided affection for the newer French writers . . . The evidence of direct drawing from the well of English is less clear [than in the case of Henryson]."¹ Similarly Mackay, in his Introduction to Small's edition of Dunbar, for the Scottish Text Society, says: "Dunbar . . . takes from him chiefly his language, which often finds parallels; but as regards the substance of his poems, only the tale of 'The Tua Mariit Wemen and the Wedo,' and the verses on his Empty Purse, show traces of imitation."²

To the general correctness of this estimate of Dunbar's debt to Chaucer, it is not my purpose to take exception. I believe, however, that the relation between the curious burlesque, *Of Sir Thomas Norray*, and *Sir Thopas*, is closer than critics have realized.

The two poems have been associated before this, but no one seems to have done more than point out the fact that both are in the tail-rime stanza, or to suggest that Dunbar may have been familiar with Chaucer's "rym doggerel." Mackay implied this latter, when he said, in his note on *Bevis of Hampton*: "Dunbar must have known this romance from Chaucer's allusions."³ Schipper, in his *William Dunbar, sein Leben und seine Gedichte*,⁴ speaking of the "Balladenton und Metrum," says "vgl. Chaucers Sir Thopas."⁵ Miss Hammond, in her recent *Bibliographical Manual*, notes that "Dunbar's burlesque Sir Thomas Norray is in the same stanza."⁶

¹ *Camb. Hist. Engl. Lit.*, II, 287.

² S. T. S. edition of Dunbar's poems, I, cxlvi.

³ "Appendix to the Introduction"; S. T. S. edition of Dunbar, I, ccix.

⁴ Berlin, 1884.

⁵ Page 221.

⁶ Page 287. Roughly speaking, this is true; though the most distinctive metrical feature of *Sir Thopas*, the use of the "double tail," in which Chaucer was going the ordi-

To stop here, however, is to state but half the case. Not only is the satirical purpose evident in both poems, and the stanza practically identical, but there are several significant parallelisms of language which, taken in connection with the two points just mentioned, make it almost certain that Dunbar wrote *Sir Thomas* either with *Sir Thopas* actually before him, or else with the lines of that easily remembered romance clearly in mind. Of course he knew *Sir Thopas*,—that one may assume. Remembering this, one finds the following parallelisms decidedly significant:—

Sir Thomas Norray:

1.

Now lythis of ane gentell
knycht,
Schir Thomas Norny, wyss
and wicht.
And full of chivalry;
Quhais father was ane Grand
Keyne,
His mother was ane Farie
Queyne,
Gottin be sossery.

(ll. 1-6.)¹*Sir Thopas.*

1.

Listeth, lordes, in good entent,
And I wol telle verament
Of mirthe and of solas;
Al of a knyght was fair and gent
In bataile and in tourneyment,
His name was sir Thopas.

y-born he was in fer contree,
In Flaundres, al biyonde the see,
At Popering, in the place;
His fader was a man ful free,
And lord he was of that contree,
As it was goddes grace.
(*Canterbury Tales*; B, 1902-1913.)

Here there is both a certain amount of verbal similarity in the introduction, and a general imitation, on the part of Dunbar, of Chaucer's method of recounting the parentage of his hero before proceeding any farther. The elf-queen whom *Sir Thopas* "wol . . love, y-wis," Dunbar has made the mother of his hero; for it would have been unfortunate to represent one of the king's fools, with whose amours the court must

nary romancers one better, is entirely absent from Dunbar's poem.

¹I quote from Schipper's edition, in the *Denkschriften der Kaiserlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, vol. 41, sec. iv, pp. 5 ff.

have been more or less familiar, as sharing Thopas's romantic devotion to a fay.²

2.

Ane fairer knycht nor he
was ane,
On ground may nothair
ryd nor gane,
Na beir bucklar nor
brand.

(ll. 7 ff.).

2.

In that contree was ther
noon
That to him dorste ryde or
goon,
Neither wyf ne childe.
(ll. 1994 ff.)

3.

He hes att werslingis beine
ane hunder,
get lay his body nevir at
wnder:

(ll. 22 and 23).

3.

Of wrastling was ther noon
his peer,
Ther any ram shal stoude.
(ll. 1931 and 1932.)

4.

Was never vyld Robeine
wnder bewch,
Nor get Roger of Clek-
kniskleuch,
So bauld a barne as he;
Gy off Gysburne, na Allan
Bell,
Na Simones sonnes of
Quhynefell,
At schot war nevir so
slie.

This aunterous knycht, qu-
har ever he vent,
Ad justinge, and at torna-
ment,
Evir moir he wan the
gre;
Was never off half so gryt
renowne
Schir Bewis the knycht of
Southe Hamptowne;
I shrew him gif I le.

(ll. 25 ff.)

4.

Men speke of romances of
prys,
Of Horn Child and of
Ypotys,
Of Bevis and Sir Gy,
Of sir Libeux and Pleyn-
damour;
But sir Thopas he bereth
the flour
Of royal chivalry.
(ll. 2086 ff.)

In these passages both poets compare their heroes to well-known figures of ballad and romance, not a common occurrence in satirical poetry. It is interesting to note, moreover, that "sir Bevis and sir Guy," whom Chaucer mentions, both reappear in Dunbar's poem: "Guy of Gysbourne," an easy change, though Chaucer must have referred to Guy of Warwick,—and "Schir Bewis the knycht of Southe Hamptowne."

²On the identity of Norray, see Schipper's notes, p. 4, and the references there cited.

5. He said he was ane licher- ous bull, That croynd bayth day and nycht. (ll. 41 and 42.)	5. He was chast and no lech- our, And sweet as is the brem- ble-flour That bereth the rede hepe. (ll. 1935 ff.)
6. This aunterouss knyght, qu- har ever he vent, Ad justinge, and at torna- ment, Evir moir he wan the gre. (ll. 31 ff.)	6. He was a knight auntrous. (l. 2099.) A knyght was fair and gent In bataille and in tourney- ment. (ll. 1905 and 1906.) Sir Thopas, he bereth the flour Of royal chivalry. (ll. 2090 and 2091.)

No one of these parallels, standing alone, would be of much significance. But considering the similarity of satirical purpose in the two poems, the practical identity of stanza, and the occurrence of a considerable number of rather striking verbal similarities, one is justified, I believe, in saying that when he wrote *Sir Thomas Norray* Dunbar was consciously imitating *Sir Thopas*.

FRANKLYN BLISS SNYDER.

Northwestern University.

'GHOST-WORDS.'

In Sweet's *Anglo-Saxon Dictionary*, p. 34b, we read the following entry:

'*cinedaben* ornamented in some way: *hyre = an cyrtel* Ct.'

The word is certainly a puzzle which will be solved when we turn to Hall's Dictionary where we find on page 56b '*cinewāden* adj. of royal purple KC 1290.' KC 1290 means Kemble's Codex Diplomaticus No. 1290 = Thorpe's *Diplom. Angl.* p. 538. The passage in question reads from line 4 on thus: *ȝ hio an Ceoldrype hyre blacena tunecena swa þær hyre leofre beo. ȝ hyre betsð haliryft. ȝ hyre betspan bindan. [ȝ Æþelf] læde þisse hwitan hyre cinewādenan cyrtel. ȝ cuffian. ȝ bindan.* The letters in brackets are supple-

mented by Thorpe who gives this rendering: 'And she (viz. Wynflæd in her will of ca. 995) gives to Ceoldryth whichever she prefers of her black tunics, and her best holy veil and her best binder, [and to Æthelf]læd her white striped kirtle and cuffs and binders.' Thorpe designates 'white striped' as conjectural translation. I do not think it can stand; *þisse hwitan* is, as far as I can see, in apposition to Æthelflæd and designates her as *Candida ista* to distinguish her from other women going by the name of Æthelflæd; *cinewāden* Hall correctly, I think, interprets as meaning 'of royal purple.' It is no doubt a compound of *cyne* and *wāden* = *wāden* = *wāden* 'hyacinthinus,' which is absent from Sweet and B.-T., though recorded by Hall. For instances of the adjective cp. *wið ðy wedenen attre* (Grein-Wülker, *AgS. Prosa*, vol. I, 323) and Napier OEGl, 7, 372 = 8, 374 *wāden* 'iacinthi(n)a.' How Sweet came to transmogrify Hall's *cinewāden* = *cynewāden* to *cinedaþen* escapes me. Certainly there is no warrant for it.

Another ghost-word is

misþegnian, *-þēnian* 'misuse'

exhibited by Sweet on page 119a of his *Dictionary* as quite a common word. As a matter of fact, it is nothing but Sweet's change of what Hall quotes as nonce-word from *Lib. Scint.*, 224, 10, '*misþenian* to misuse, abuse.' The passage in question as printed by E. W. Rhodes is this:

*fram flæscum þinum aceorf hi þhe na symle þe
a carnibus tuis absceide illam ne semper te
miswenige.
abutatur.*

I hardly think we shall go amiss in taking the last interpretation to stand for *miswenige*, either the scribe miscopied the symbol = *w* and *r*, or the editor misread the two letters which sometimes very closely resemble *þ* and *n*. As to *miswenian* 'abuti,' compare *foruerit* 'abusus,' Grf. 1135. Also Sweet's (p. 136a)

penn 'kind of cataract (disease of the eye)'

will be nothing but a misreading of *Leechd.*, I, 374^a *ȝ wið wenne*, printed by Cockayne *þenne*. Certainly we read *wið wænne* in the exactly corresponding passage, *Leechd.*, III, 4^b =